

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 and 28-55, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on informalities and on prior art grounds. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections/rejections based on the following discussion.

**I. The 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph, Rejection**

Claims 1-26 and 28-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. These rejections are traversed as explained below.

The Examiner asserts that it is unclear how a function of uniform data definitions or a function of an area of interest pertains to the system. To resolve this issue, the Examiner suggested that the language "as a function of" be replaced with "according to." The Examiner's suggestion is appreciated. An amendment reflecting the Examiner's suggested language has been made to the claims; thus overcoming the present rejection. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**II. The Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1-6, 9-13, 15-24, 28-32, 34-43, 46-50, and 52-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,565). Claims 7, 25, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Beldock in view of Petke et al. 09/918,107

(U.S. Patent No. 6,163,732). Claims 8, 26, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Beldock in view of Barrett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,144). Claims 14, 33, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Beldock in view of Smalley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,549). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

**A. The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Beldock**

Claims 1-6, 9-13, 15-24, 28-32, 34-43, 46-50, and 52-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,565).

Beldock et al. discloses a data processing method for an environmental certification program which defines a plurality of predefined criteria which must be met by a participant in the program in order to receive a certification mark for use on goods and in advertising materials.

**B. The Rejection Based on Beldock in view of Petke**

Claims 7, 25, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Beldock in view of Petke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,163,732).

**C. The Rejection Based on Beldock in view of Barrett**

Claims 8, 26, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Beldock in view of Barrett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,144).

09/918,107

**D. The Rejection Based on Beldock in view of Smalley**

Claims 14, 33, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Beldock in view of Smalley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,549).

**III. Formal Matters and Conclusion**


In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-26 and 28-55, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary.

Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/6/06



Konstantina M. Katcheves  
Reg. No. 54,818

Gibb I.P. Law Firm, LLC  
2568-A Riva Road  
Suite 304  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
Customer Number: 29154  
09/918,107